

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-742
H. R. 17588

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Index and summary of H. R. 17588 | 1 |
| Digest of Public Law 89-742 | 2 |

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 17588

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Sept. 8, 1966 | Rep. Gathings introduced H. R. 17588 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print as introduced. |
| Oct. 7, 1966 | House committee voted to report H. R. 17588. |
| Oct. 11, 1966 | House committee reported H. R. 17588 with amendment. H. Report 2223. Print of bill and report. |
| Oct. 17, 1966 | House passed H. R. 17588 as reported. |
| Oct. 18, 1966 | H. R. 17588 was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred. |
| Oct. 20, 1966 | Senate committee discharged. Senate passed H. R. 17588 without amendment. |
| Nov. 2, 1966 | Approved: Public Law 89-742. |

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-742

ASSIGNMENT OF AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM PAYMENTS. Amends section 8 (g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to authorize officers of lending institutions, including Farmers Home Administration and production credit associations (as well as ASC county offices) to witness a farmer's assignment of an Agricultural Conservation Program payment.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 8, 1966

Mr. GATHERINGS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic
4 Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), is
5 amended to read as follows:

6 “(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer
7 under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by
8 him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance
9 making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural com-
10 modity, or performing a conservation practice. Such as-
11 signment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a

1 member of the county committee or by an employee of such
2 committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose
3 deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Cor-
4 poration, the Farmers Home Administration, or a produc-
5 tion credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Admin-
6 istration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded
7 officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be
8 filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not
9 be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This
10 provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any
11 liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if pay-
12 ment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence
13 of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such
14 regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the
15 provisions of this subsection."

SECRET //
REF ID: A65222
2013-02-06

LINE A

By [redacted]

1. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
2. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

3. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
4. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

5. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
6. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

7. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
8. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

9. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
10. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

LINE B

By [redacted]

1. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
2. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

3. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
4. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

5. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
6. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

7. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
8. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

9. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
10. [redacted] (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

By Mr. GATHINGS

SEPTEMBER 8, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Oct 7, 1966

14. TARIFF. Passed as reported H. R. 6413, to provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax, when rendered unfit for beverage use. pp. 24611-12
The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 13363, to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965. p. D972

15. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Passed without amendment S. 801, to improve the balance-of-payments position of the U. S. by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 24619-20

16. CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15304, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location. p. D971

17. ACP ASSIGNMENTS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 17588, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments. p. D971

18. WATERSHEDS. Rep. Moore inserted his remarks at the dedication of the first structure of the Harmon Creek Watershed. pp. 24667-8
The Agriculture Committee approved work plans for the following watershed projects: Vanar Wash., Ariz., and N. Mex., and Prides Creek, Ind. p. D971

19. WILDLIFE. A subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee approved for full committee action H. Con. Res. 1032, amended, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the worldwide conservation of wildlife and the convening in 1968 of the international conference on the conservation of wildlife. p. D972

20. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Several Representatives reviewed the activities of the 89th Congress. pp. 24670-2, 24675-9

21. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from FPC a publication, "World Power Data, 1964." p. 24689

22. INFLATION. Rep. Ashbrook inserted two items which he stated illustrates how the "actual big spender, the Federal Government, tries to place part of the responsibility for rising prices on the consumer." pp. 24672-3
Rep. Mathias reported his findings on a tour of retail stores, supermarkets, etc., to learn the impact of inflation. pp. 24680-1

23. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Boggs announced that on Mon. the House will consider the preservation of historic properties bill, and on Tues. and the balance of the week will consider the demonstration cities bill. p. 24661

24. ADJOURNED until Mon., Oct. 10. p. 24688

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. WOOL IMPORTS. Rep. McCormack inserted an article which favors imposition of country-by-country quotas to curb excessive imports of fabric and apparel. pp. A5180-1

26. SENIOR CITIZENS. Rep. Fogarty inserted an address, "Older Americans and Their Government." pp. A5181-3
27. LEGISLATIVE RECORD. Reps. May and Broomfield inserted reports on the accomplishments of the 89th Congress. pp. A5187-8, A5191-2
28. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Callan commanding and inserting Secretary Freeman's speech noting the value of recreational development in rural areas. pp. A5188-90
29. LIVESTOCK. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bandstra urging passage of legislation to prohibit large-scale feeding of livestock by meatpacking firms and retail chainstores engaged in meatpacking operations. pp. A5196-8
30. OPINION POLL. Rep. Rogers, Fla., inserted the results of an opinion poll, including items of interest to this Department. p. A5199

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. LANDS. H. R. 18257 by Rep. Kee, to provide for the restoration and rehabilitation of lands damaged by surface or strip mining; to Agriculture Committee.
32. FOREIGN TRADE. H. Res. 1043 by Rep. Patman, investigation of European Markets; to Rules Committee.
33. ORGANIZATION. S. 3888 by Sen. Mondale, to establish a commission to investigate the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization and methods of operation of the executive branch of the Government; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author pp. 24691-4
34. DISASTER RELIEF; CCC. S. 3894 by Sen. McCarthy, to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase hay and make it available for use in feeding livestock in disaster and other emergency areas, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make cost assistance payments to livestockmen on hay purchased to feed livestock in areas affected by catastrophies; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author pp. 24694-5

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS OCT. 10:

Watershed projects, S. Public Works (exec).
Consumer problems, H. Gov't Operations.
Poverty bill, conferees (exec).
Dept. of Transportation, conferees (exec).

000

~~DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings~~

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

20250

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
'FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 12, 1966
For actions of Oct. 11, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 174

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------------|------------|
| ACP assignments..... | 3 | Education..... | 23 | Opinion poll..... | 36 |
| Air pollution..... | 7 | Farm program..... | 2 | Paperwork..... | 19 |
| Appropriations..... | 1,6,20 | Flood control..... | 42 | Personnel..... | 5,30,37,40 |
| Area development..... | 17 | Flood insurance..... | 10 | Poverty..... | 31 |
| Banking..... | 16 | Food for peace..... | 25,35 | Publications..... | 4 |
| Buildings..... | 43 | Foreign Service..... | 43 | Retirement..... | 5,37 |
| Claims..... | 6 | Historic sites..... | 12,21 | Senior Service Corps..... | 24 |
| Congressional..... reorganization..... | 9 | Labeling..... | 39 | Supergrades..... | 40 |
| Conservation..... | 13 | Lands..... | 34 | Taxation..... | 22 |
| Credit..... | 38 | Legislative program..... | 30 | Transportation..... | 18 |
| Demonstration cities.... | 32 | Legislative record..... | 33 | Veterinary facilities... | 23 |
| Diet foods..... | 39 | Loans..... | 41 | Wage-price policy..... | 15 |
| Economy..... | 28 | Manpower..... | 11 | Watersheds..... | 8,27 |
| | | Meat imports..... | 26 | World Farm Center..... | 14 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. McGovern criticized House rejection of food-for-peace conference report. Sen. Hruska claimed meat imports rising. Rep. Quie inserted LeRoux statement criticizing farm-program administration. House agreed to conference report on public works appropriation bill. House committee reported bill authorizing assignment of ACP payments.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17787, the public works appropriation bill. pp. 25036-41
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 17637, the military construction appropriation bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 25022
Both Houses agreed to the second conference report on H. R. 15941, the defense appropriation bill. This bill will now be sent to the President.
pp. 25027-36, 25004-7
2. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Quie inserted and commended a statement by Frank LeRoux, formerly of this Department, criticizing administration of the farm program.
pp. 25117-8

3. ACP ASSIGNMENTS. The Agriculture Committee reported ~~without~~ amendment H. R. 17588, authorizing assignment of ACP payments (H. Rept. 2223). p. 25144

4. PUBLICATIONS. Passed without amendment S. 3809, to authorize the Public Printer to print for and deliver to the General Services Administration an additional copy of Government publications. The bill had been reported without amendment earlier in the day (H. Rept. 2221). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 25023, 25144

5. PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments S. 699, to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses. pp. 25023-4

6. CLAIMS. Concurred in the Senate amendment, with an amendment, to H. R. 1665, to provide for the Court of Claims to render advisory services to the Congress, upon request, in connection with consideration of private bills. pp. 25024-6
Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate for payment of various claims and judgments (H. Doc. 522). p. 25144

7. AIR POLLUTION. Conferees were appointed on S. 3112, to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 25027

8. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Agriculture Committee a report on approval of various watershed projects. p. 25052
The Public Works Committee approved various watershed projects. p. D986

9. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., inserted a Republican Policy Committee statement favoring action on H. R. 17873, the congressional reorganization bill, before adjournment of this session. pp. 25108-9

10. FLOOD INSURANCE. Rep. Boggs spoke in support of his bill, H. R. 18213, to provide a national program of flood insurance. pp. 25121-2

11. MANPOWER. Rep. O'Hara, Mich., inserted a statement recommending additional coordination of Federal manpower programs. pp. 25132-4

12. HISTORIC SITES. Rep. Pepper spoke in favor of S. 3035, to preserve historic sites. pp. 25137-8

13. CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 15304, to authorize this Department to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for establishment of a center at a more suitable location (H. Rept. 2225). p. 25145

14. WORLD FARM CENTER. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. Con. Res. 313, to endorse the concept of a World Farm Center (H. Rept. 2227). p. 25145

15. WAGE-PRICE POLICY. The Government Operations Committee submitted a report, "Strengthening Wage-Price Guideposts" (H. Rept. 2231). p. 25145

16. BANKING. The conferees submitted a report on S. 3158, to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and

ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS

OCTOBER 11, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and Ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 17588]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 17588) to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike the word "subection" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsection".

PURPOSE

H.R. 17588 is a clean bill which supersedes H.R. 13863. Both bills simplify the requirements of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks.

Present law limits the authority to witness signatures of farmers, making such assignments, to a member of the county or other local committee, or the treasurer or the secretary of such committee. This legislation broadens the authority as to who may witness the signature of a farmer wishing to assign a program by providing that if the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farmers Home Administration, or a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, the assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution.

In its report on H.R. 13863 the Department of Agriculture suggested several amendments which would further simplify and expedite the signing of assignments. In further discussion of this matter, the committee felt these departmental suggestions were desirable, and

a clean bill, H.R. 17588, was introduced and approved by the committee. This new bill contains the departmental recommendations as they are listed in their report on H.R. 13863.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The committee feels that it is desirable to expedite the process of signing assignments as much as possible without in any manner damaging the security of the farmer, the lending institution, or the Department of Agriculture. The committee feels that H.R. 17588 will do a great deal to promote the efficient administration of the program.

The farmer, in many cases, was required to make several trips to his local committee office before he could find a member of the committee or the secretary or treasurer of the committee present to witness his signature of the assignment. This legislation would make the execution of assignments simpler by increasing the number of persons eligible to witness the signatures of assignors. At the same time, however, it would continue as witnesses persons who are respectable citizens and who are acquainted with the assignor.

The committee urges the Department of Agriculture to seek ways to expedite all such proceedings within the scope of existing law. Wherever needless duplication or extra steps are taken in these administrative activities of the Department, no one is helped and the time of all concerned is wasted.

COST

As specified in the departmental report, no additional cost is anticipated as a result of enactment of this legislation.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Following is the report of the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of H.R. 13863 with amendments. These amendments have been embodied without change into H.R. 17588 which supersedes H.R. 13863.

Also following is the report of the Farm Credit Administration recommending enactment of H.R. 13863.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of March 29, 1966, for a report on H.R. 13863, a bill to simplify the requirements of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks.

This Department recommends that the bill be passed with suggested amendments.

The bill broadens the authority as to who may witness the signature of a farmer wishing to assign a program payment by providing that if the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal

Deposit Insurance Corporation, or a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, the assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution. Present law limits the authority to witness signatures to a member of the county or other local committee, or the treasurer or the secretary of such committee.

We are in favor of the changes proposed but also recommend that all of section 8(g) be rewritten to further simplify the handling of assignments, update its provisions, and authorize that, if the assignee is the Farmers Home Administration, the assignment may be witnessed by a bonded official of that agency. A copy of the proposed wording is enclosed.

These changes would expand the purposes for which an assignment is authorized to include handling or marketing an agricultural commodity or performing a conservation practice. Employees of the county committee would be permitted to witness the farmer's signature. Specific authority would be added for the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe necessary regulations.

It is believed that the enactment of this proposed legislation would result in no additional cost.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITTNER,
Acting Secretary.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request for a report on H.R. 13863, a bill to simplify the requirements of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks.

Section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act now requires an assignment of a payment made under that section to be signed by the farmer, witnessed by a member or by the treasurer or secretary of the county or other local committee and filed with the county agent or the county committee. The bill would change the witnessing procedure by providing that where the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or a production credit association, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution.

The production credit associations, of which there are now 471 in the United States, are supervised by the Farm Credit Administration. These associations are engaged in making short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers and ranchers. Not infrequently, as security for a loan an association will take an assignment of moneys due or to become due the farmer-borrower of the type with which section 8(g) is concerned. The present method of accomplishing such assignment is cumbersome. After a farmer has arranged for a loan, he must go to the county office in order to have the assignment witnessed by a mem-

ber or officer of the county or other local committee. This may be some distance from the point at which the loan is made.

Under the procedure contemplated by the bill, the assignment of payments covered by section 8(g) could be accomplished in the offices of the lending institutions. This we believe to be desirable and, therefore, we would recommend the enactment of H.R. 13863.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Very truly yours,

R. B. TOOTELL,
Governor.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENT

SEC. 8. * * *

* * * * *

¶(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance making a crop. Such assignment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a member of the county or other local committee, or by the treasurer or the secretary of such committee, and filed with the county agent or the county committee. Such assignment shall include the statement that the assignment is not made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if payment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence of any such assignment.¶

(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural commodity, or performing a conservation practice. Such assignment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a member of the county committee or by an employee of such committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farmers Home Administration, or a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if payment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.



89TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

Union Calendar No. 992

H. R. 17588

[Report No. 2223]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 8, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

OCTOBER 11, 1966

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic
4 Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), is
5 amended to read as follows:

6 “(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer
7 under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by
8 him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance
9 making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural com-
10 modity, or performing a conservation practice. Such as-

1 signment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a
2 member of the county committee or by an employee of such
3 committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose
4 deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Cor-
5 poration, the Farmers Home Administration, or a produc-
6 tion credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Admin-
7 istration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded
8 officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be
9 filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not
10 be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This
11 provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any
12 liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if pay-
13 ment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence
14 of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such
15 regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the
16 provisions of this ~~subeetion~~ subsection."

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17588

[Report No. 2223]

A BILL

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

By Mr. GATHINGS

SEPTEMBER 8, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

October 11, 1966

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 18, 1966
For actions of Oct. 17, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 178

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------------|------------|--|-------|
| ACP..... | 9 | Foreign trade..... | 19 | Rural housing..... | 27 |
| Airports..... | 7 | Health services..... | 18 | Rural-renewal loans..... | 2 |
| Appropriations..... | 6, 21, 27 | Historic sites..... | 37 | School lunch..... | 21 |
| Cities..... | 26 | Labeling..... | 3 | Seed..... | 40 |
| Congressional..... accomplishments..... | 29, 30 | Lands..... | 8, 16 | Summer lunches..... | 1 |
| Congressional..... reorganization..... | 22 | Legislative powers..... | 25 | Supplemental..... appropriations..... | 6, 21 |
| Conservation..... | 9, 10 | Loans..... | 2, 26 | Taxation..... | 15 |
| Dairy..... | 23 | Military construction... | 27 | Transportation..... | 39 |
| Disaster relief..... | 13, 33 | Packaging..... | 2 | Veterinary education..... | 5 |
| Education..... | 5 | Personnel..... | 20, 24, 35 | Wage-price controls..... | 30 |
| Farm program..... | 32 | Political activity..... | 20 | Water pollution..... | 17 |
| Fish protein..... | 12 | Poverty..... | 4 | Watersheds..... | 14 |
| Food prices..... | 28 | Reclamation..... | 34 | Wildlife..... | 38 |
| | | Recreation..... | 2, 36 | World Farm Center..... | 11 |
| | | Rivers..... | 16 | | |

HIGHLIGHTS: see page 5

HOUSE

1. SUMMER LUNCHES. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 9339, to authorize a children's summer lunch program. pp. 26032-7
2. RURAL-RENEWAL LOANS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 688, to authorize rural-renewal loans for recreation purposes and for private non-profit organizations. pp. 26046-7

3. PACKAGING; LABELING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 985, the fair packaging and labeling bill. pp. 26062-4
4. POVERTY. Received the conference report on H. R. 15111, to continue and amend various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act (H. Rept. 2298). pp. 26050-61
5. VETERINARY EDUCATION. Concurred in a Senate amendment to H. R. 3348, to authorize construction of facilities for teaching veterinary medicine and loans for students of veterinary medicine, and disagreed to two Senate amendments. pp. 26065-6
6. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to waive points of order on H. R. 18381, the supplemental appropriation bill. p. 26144
Received the conference report on H. R. 17636, the D. C. appropriation bill (H. Rept. 2292). pp. 26010-12
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 18119, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 26032
7. AIRPORTS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 476, providing for construction of airports in or close to national parks, monuments, and recreation areas. Rep. Staggers said this bill is identical to H. R. 11089. The bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26038
8. LANDS. Passed without amendment S. 84, to provide for reimbursement of Wyo. for improvements made on certain Eden project lands in Sweetwater County if or when the lands revert to the U. S. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26000
9. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM. Passed as reported H. R. 17588, to authorize assignments of ACP payments. pp. 26006-7
10. CONSERVATION. After discussion, H. R. 15304, to authorize the Department to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., was passed over because the official objectors felt it should not be considered by unanimous-consent procedure. pp. 26007-8
11. WORLD FARM CENTER. After discussion, H. Con. Res. 313, to endorse the concept of the World Farm Center, was passed over at the request of Rep. Pelly. p. 26008
12. FISH PROTEIN. Received the conference report on S. 2720, to authorize the Interior Department to develop practicable and economic means for the production of fish protein concentrate (H. Rept. 2290). pp. 26012-3
13. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1861, to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. pp. 26024-32
14. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for various watershed projects. pp. 26144, 26146-7
15. TAXATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 17607, to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property (p. 25999). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the adoption of this act will not involve any more than \$200,000 a year as additional expense or per diem travel to these training seminars.

I presume—and does the gentleman from New York know or can he advise the House—whether my presumption is correct or incorrect—whether this would be subject to the veto of the Governors when this personnel is withdrawn from the respective States and Commonwealths for any such training seminars, and that there is no preemption on the part of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of this personnel which exists in the various States?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is absolutely correct. The States could participate or not participate, if they saw fit.

And, further, I might point out the fact that the bill was supported by the State people—the Association of Food and Drug People of the United States—and there will not be a draining of their personnel. I believe, further, that it is their opinion that such seminars would be helpful, to a considerable degree, in the training of State personnel.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, but realizing that there is some danger of constantly increasing Federal encroachment upon the duties heretofore assumed by the various States, and always being alert against any perversion of the 10th amendment to the Constitution, I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13884

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Professional Training and Cooperation Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 702 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 372) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) The Secretary is authorized to accept from State and local authorities, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, any assistance in the administration and enforcement of this Act which he may request and which they may be able and willing to provide and, if so agreed, may pay in advance or otherwise for the reasonable cost of such assistance.

"(2) The Secretary may cooperate with and give technical and other assistance to State and local authorities in the administration and enforcement of their laws and regulations relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics.

"(3) In order to assist in carrying out the purposes of this subsection, the Secretary may provide training (including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment) to personnel of State or local authorities (in matters relating to the administration or enforcement of this Act or of the laws administered by such authorities) as an integral part of any training program for personnel of the Department, or may (pursuant to arrangement with such authorities) establish and carry out a special training program or programs in such matters for personnel of such authorities either directly or through contracts or arrangements with appropriate institutions or agencies, including Federal agencies, and

may in either case pay to such State or local personnel, while attending such training programs away from their homes or regular places of employment and while traveling in connection therewith, their travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

SEC. 3. Section 702 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) of such section the following new sentences: "In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may make contracts for the conduct of special tests and analyses and may pay therefor in advance or otherwise, as he may determine. The Secretary may likewise contract, and pay in advance or otherwise, for information (1) furnished to him by hospitals or other institutions or organizations or informants (except information furnished to him by manufacturers and others required by or pursuant to this Act to furnish such information) and (2) bearing on the safety or effectiveness of drugs or other articles within the scope of this Act."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, beginning in line 4, strike out "section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2)" and insert in lieu thereof the following "section 5703 of title 5, United States Code,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD DELEGATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1556) to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1556

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 246) is amended by adding after subsection (j) the following subsection:

"(k) To delegate, by published order or rule and subject to the Administrative Procedure Act, any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more hearing examiners, members or employees of the Board, or Federal Reserve banks. The assignment of responsibility for the performance of any function that the Board determines to delegate shall be a function of the Chairman. The Board shall, upon the vote of one member, review action taken at a delegated level within such time and in such manner as the Board shall by rule prescribe."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, S. 1556 would authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to dele-

gate any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more hearing examiners, members, or employees of the Board, or Federal Reserve banks.

The Chairman of the Board would be authorized to assign responsibility for the performance of functions delegated by the Board. Any one member of the Board might under the bill require the Board to review actions taken under the delegation.

S. 1556 would give the Federal Reserve Board the same powers of delegation which have been granted to most independent boards and commissions. Such authority is possessed, for example, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

It is expected that the enactment of this bill, by relieving the Board of unnecessary detail, would enable it to act more effectively and more expeditiously on the major functions which would not be delegated. It would be appropriate for the Board to indicate in future annual reports the extent to which this authority to delegate is exercised and the benefits resulting from such delegations.

The legislation has been requested and recommended for enactment by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 18021) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that in the committee report accompanying this bill there are no department reports printed, and the objectors have no way of knowing how the various departments of Government feel about this legislation.

We have had information to the effect that two amendments will be offered. It is our further understanding that those who were planning to offer those amendments are not present today. Further, we have a number of questions on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. This is important legislation, and it is urgent. We cannot understand why the Members are not here who expressed interest, because each Member was notified that this would be up on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WIDNALL told me personally it would be all right with him. So did Mr. MULTER. And the others, of course, I have not seen, but they were notified that this was coming up, and they are not here.

It is an urgent piece of legislation involving the Small Business Administration and the SBIC. I hope that the ob-

ectors can afford to let it pass, because it is so much needed and so necessary. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18021, a bill to amend the small Business Investment Act of 1958, would grant the Administrator of the Small Business Administration powers urgently needed to assist him in the fulfillment of his responsibilities in supervising the very important small business investment company program.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM

Under the small business investment company program, SBA is authorized to license SBIC's, to provide capital funds to them through the provision of subordinate debentures from each such company in the amount not to exceed \$700,000. The SBIC so licensed must match dollar for dollar the funds obtained from SBA from private sources. In addition to these matching funds, SBA is authorized to lend funds for operating purposes to an SBIC in an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the company's statutory capital and surplus, or \$4 million, whichever is less. There are 686 licensed small business investment companies at the present time. The total Government investment in these companies, as of May 31, 1966, amounted to \$270,588,000, while the investment from private sources in these companies totaled \$462,310,000. Since the inception of the small business investment company program in 1958, as an industry all of the SBIC's have made nearly \$1 billion available to small businesses in over 20,000 separate financial transactions. I know of no program that greater exemplifies the determination of Congress and preserve and protect our free enterprise system. The small business investment company program, although not considered as part of the body of our antitrust laws, is one of the bulwarks against the inroads of monopolies and anticompetitive practices. Lying at the very foundation of our private enterprise system is the concept of preserving the competitive rights of small business concerns. The small business investment company program accomplishes this basic goal by insuring the availability of financial resources to small businesses throughout the United States.

NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION

The bill before us today is designed to provide SBA with tools needed to insure the proper and effective regulation of the program. As we all know, this program has not yet fulfilled its potential. In large measure, its shortcomings have stemmed from the inability of the SBA Administrator to take necessary administrative action to correct deficiencies.

The best current information available indicates that there are at present approximately 250 "problem" SBIC's. These companies have about \$125 million of private capital and \$75 million of Government funds. H.R. 18021 would enable SBA to deal more effectively with these problem companies.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill provides SBA with necessary additional administrative power to remove or suspend officers and directors of

an SBIC, after record hearings, wherein it has been established that the officer or director knowingly and willingly has committed a substantial violation of law or has willingly and knowingly substantially breached his fiduciary duty when such violation of law or breach of duty is one involving personal dishonesty. The bill further provides SBA with the authority to administratively revoke the license of an SBIC. In addition, SBA is given administrative authority for the issuance of cease-and-desist orders against officers, directors, and other persons involved with the SBIC program. Of course, and I do want to stress this, all of the foregoing administrative tools can only be exercised under the bill in the context of fair adjudicatory hearings. This bill provides for appropriate administrative proceedings, as well as judicial review, to insure procedural safeguards where these powers are applied.

Another provision of the bill designed to provide for more effective administration of the program is that imposing civil penalties on a small business investment company for its failure to make a timely filing of required reports. The penalties provided for by this section, however, will not apply where such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect.

THE HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

S. 3695, which passed the Senate on September 6, 1966, is in substance a companion bill to the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, H.R. 18021. The House and Senate bills are virtually the same and are equally intended to provide the Small Business Administration with needed tools to improve the operation of the SBIC program. Pages 2 and 3 of your committee's report set forth in detail the differences between the House and Senate bills. I have already received some indication that the Senate will accept the House version of the bill if the bill is adopted by the House as reported from committee. In addition to such support, your committee's bill has received the support of the Small Business Administration, as well as the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the bill H.R. 18021. This is a vital piece of remedial legislation urgently needed to insure the future success of the small business investment company program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, again I say to the gentleman that there are no department reports printed in the report accompanying the bill. I do not know how these departments feel. That is one of the criteria that the committee of objectors uses in deciding whether or not this bill should go through under this Consent Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that Mr. Boutin testified that he had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget on this, and this was worked out with the Small Business Committee. I know the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and

the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Small Business Administration and the Bureau of the Budget testified it was considered urgent and necessary. They worked night and day for several days and finally got a complete agreement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the objectors realize that it is a late hour in the session, and it is sometimes difficult to provide full information. In connection with this we do not know why it is necessary to grant additional powers to the SBA Administrator, or why it is necessary to provide needed tools for tighter enforcement of the SBA Act, or what violations have occurred which necessitated receiving civil penalties of the SBIC for failure to file reports.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we think that this is not the proper way that important legislation like this should be adopted by the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the measure be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

IN ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17588) to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I interrogate the chief sponsor of this measure?

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like the gentleman to explain the bill.

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

This bill provides that assignments of Government payments may be witnessed before a little larger group has heretofore been the case. Heretofore when a farmer came in and wanted to assign his payments he had to go to the county committee to execute the assignment. The assignment is usually made at the bank for the benefit of some creditor. That is the normal place where you make the assignments. This bill provides that in addition to an employee of the CCC or of the local PCA office, that you may make the assignment before an officer of a bank or before any member or employee of the local county committee.

It also allows the assignments to be made before officers of the Farmers Home Administration, or a supervisor of the Farm Credit Administration.

The only purpose of the bill is to make it a little more convenient to make the assignments that are currently made by the thousands during the year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take it by the explanation that it will be in this way easier to make assignments, and permit them to be witnessed out in the field by an employee of the association.

Let me ask this question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Billie Sol Estes scandal

and the salad oil scandal recently in New York and New Jersey involving assignments in matters of this kind, do you think it is good to let down the bars and make it easier for assignments of this nature to be made?

Is not the present safeguard a pretty good one—you have to come into the office and make out an assignment in front of a member of the committee.

Mr. POAGE. Frankly, it seems to me as a practical matter, you actually get more protection by going to a bank than you do coming into a county office.

What you do as a practical matter is you walk into the county office and there is some clerk sitting there and you say, "I want to sign my name." And you sign it. She signs as a witness. She has not the slightest idea of what is in the instrument. That is all there is to it. Of course, I realize our whole notary system is notorious for that kind of practice. But I believe our banks, and this is confined to banks whose deposits are guaranteed under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—I believe our banks are generally a little more likely to be alert as to what is being assigned than are these county PCA offices.

It is often a burden to come to a county office. For instance, in my home county the county office is in Waco, my hometown. McLennan County is a rather large county, there are banks located 20 miles from Waco. Those people who do business out there have to come to the county seat to sign these assignments. It seems to me an impracticable thing to require every one of these assignments which day by day go through these banks should be witnessed in the county office while there are private or individual assignments by the thousands which are witnessed just as this bill would require. To require that the parties have to come to the county seat to sign them just seems to be putting a little extra burden on the people with no corresponding benefit. None of the scandals to which the gentleman has referred occurred as a result of any signing before any official of a bank or another agency of government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but this bill permits the assignment to be made out in the field—in the country—on the farm where it can be witnessed by an employee.

Mr. POAGE. By an official of a bank that has its deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I do not recall that that is what the bill provides. It seems to me it can be an employee of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. POAGE. The bill requires that the execution be before a bonded officer of one of the lending institutions named or bank whose deposits are insured by the FDIC or by the Farmers Home Administration or the PCA supervisor of the Farm Credit Administration.

Those are all agencies that are considered responsible, and I think their record is just as good—and I make no charge of any bad record on the part of

anybody else, but their record is just as good as the record of the county officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

The bill also requires that the notice of assignment be filed with the county committee.

Is there any penalty or is the assignment void if they fail to file notice of it with the committee? I am thinking again of not making it easier so that a wholesale fraud can again occur in some of the Department of Agriculture activities involving money for farmers.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman has raised a question that is certainly a legitimate and proper question.

My own view as a lawyer would be that if you do not conform to the full requirements, you have no assignment which is good against third parties. I think that is the general rule of law. It was felt that there was no purpose in putting it in here because if you are dealing with assignments and if the requirements which are stipulated by law are not carried out, you simply have not made any valid transfer. I think until the assignment is filed with the county committee that you simply have not carried out the required formalities and you are in the same position that you would be with a mortgage that you have not filed with the county clerk. That is what you have to do under the laws of practically every State in the Union.

You have got to do the same thing here and file it with the county committee in order to make it valid and binding against third parties. If you want to take the chance and just rely on the parties doing what they are supposed to do, of course, you do not have to file it. It would still be binding between the parties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman seems to make a good legislative record, and it does not open the door to fraud and it is for the convenience of farmers, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17588

A bill to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), is amended to read as follows:

"(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural commodity, or performing a conservation practice. Such assignment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a member of the county committee or by an employee of such committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farmers Home Administration, or a production credit association sup-

ervised by the Farm Credit Administration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if payment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike the word "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsection".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELOCATION OF PLEASANTON PLANT MATERIALS CENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15304) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to one or two phases of this bill before we pass it over. It seems to me that this bill has some especial merit. It is a long ways from any area in which I have a personal interest. It is in California. But it seems to me that there are some pretty valid reasons which we should consider before we repudiate the bill.

The Federal Government now owns the Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif. The city has grown almost completely around this plant center. It has become urban property, and is neither suitable for the purpose for which it was originally established, nor is it in a good location, because we do not need these kinds of centers in urban areas.

Alameda County, of course, wants the land. They want to enlarge their county fair. The State of California, which contributes half of the cost of the operations of the Center, feels that it is better to relocate the Center, and it has urged the Federal Government to join in the relocation. The relocation can be made at an advantage to all of the parties concerned. We propose to allow the sale of the property to Alameda County and they are to pay for it, to pay its full present appraised value, and with that

money the Federal Government can go to a more rural area and with less money buy a site better suited to the needs of the Department of Agriculture, and presumably at a substantial saving.

The committee has also required that before they buy anything else that they give consideration to Government-owned land in the same area, particularly to Camp San Luis Obispo Military Reservation, which is now owned by the Federal Government, and where it seems quite probable that we have all of the natural conditions needed for this type of plant propagation center.

It is one of those things that has come before our committee that appears to us to give the Federal Government a real opportunity to make a right good trade, and if we pass up the opportunity we will have helped no one, because we now have our operations where they are at a big disadvantage from the agriculture standpoint.

I at least wanted to present the facts and I appreciate the gentleman's forbearance in allowing me to do so, because while I have no personal interest in the situation—it seems to me we should give consideration to these points.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's vocal explanation of the merit of this case. It came through loud and clear. I submit that it is not the position of the objectors to rule on the merits of legislation per se. After a distinguished committee like the Committee on Agriculture and the gentleman from Texas has reported a bill, we can assume they are so. The question here is simply one of procedure; namely, whether it should happen by unanimous consent, or not.

I submit that this would authorize the Secretary unusual powers with the proceeds of the sale of the center, including use of the proceeds of the sale until such time as expended "for the purposes hereof."

In sum total, Mr. Speaker, what it amounts to is that this is a subject which should be discussed and debated and not handled by unanimous consent in the waning days of the Congress.

For that reason I again ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion and his cooperation. I realize that he is trying to do this in a responsible manner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WORLD FARM CENTER

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 313) to endorse the concept of World Farm Center.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to express my great disappointment at the action of our colleague from

Washington in taking exception to the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 313.

I believe very strongly that the House of Representatives is doing a great disservice to the many people who are working so diligently on the global problem of providing the required food for the world's expanding population. The United States is the world's leading food producer, and California's agricultural industry is our country's largest. The proposed World Farm Center, which is entirely a private undertaking and would not require the expenditure of Government funds, would serve to expand the understanding of all our people on the rapid advances being made, what can be done, and what we can anticipate in the future in the world's most vital industry.

It is my earnest hope that we can correct this situation. Therefore, under unanimous consent I place my letter to our colleagues from Washington, which explains in more detail the measure to which he excepted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1966.
Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I appreciate the opportunity to bring to your attention the strong feeling we entertain as to the importance of H. Con. Res. 313 passed over at your request this morning.

As the original author of this proposal, some 3½ years ago, I can state with authority the background and content of the measure. If I am not impressive with the logic of my presentation, I hope you will realize the strength of my sincerity and convictions.

That anyone would fail to perceive the great National interest implicit in the project referred to in the resolution, honestly escaped my consideration. The great problem of the world food supply has so dominated the arena of political discussions recently, it seemed elementary that a constructive, imaginative and creative proposal to serve this great need would be seen as a National contribution. It is my concern with the central problem of world famine and food shortage that originally attracted my interest in and support for the World Farm Center.

This idea which I shall outline briefly below originated with a group of Californians in farm equipment, farm production, food processing, food packaging and farm finance. After six years of preliminary planning, research and education groundwork, the group has attracted the support of every responsible segment of agri-business in our State and has as one of its directors the State Director of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Paul. The project last year was recognized by a resolution passed by both the Senate and Assembly of the State of California.

It is my belief, and that of those who are committed to the World Farm Center, that the growing of foods stuff cannot be separated from the important development of fertilizers and insecticides; the necessary improvements in farm machinery and the latest technology of seed advancement. All of these operate in tandem with the growing of crops. Then there is the important marriage between the farm and overall flood control, irrigation and soil conservation. Finally, after the harvest, the farmer is immediately interrelated to marketing, processing, packaging and distribution. All of these together are the great team effort of American agri-business, unique in the world today.

The tremendous showing of America's food production has rested upon the mutual

growth, development and technological advance in each sector of this great business complex to which we have referred. This full fold plan is the real effective way to demonstrate the agricultural revolution of the United States. Too often our approaches internationally have been segmented. We insist that land reform is the great answer. Or, we insist that fertilizers and chemicals hold the miracle of progress. Again forces move ahead who hail improved seed as the sole key to success.

The farm center concept born and nourished out of the experience of the private entrepreneurs who have lived this revolution presents the over-view—a powerful unit project where the inter-related, interdependent aspects of agri-business can be seen as a whole in one gigantic show-place. The miniature of what the Department of Commerce shows to be a \$140 billion section of our Gross National Product.

The farm center is designed to demonstrate in one place the inter-workings of the various supporting elements that in the United States has brought the greatest yield per acre in the history of mankind and has delivered it to the consumer at the lowest unit cost.

The questions that you have had in your mind were raised before the Committee on Agriculture. They were persuaded, as I hope you will be, that in this day of emphasis upon urbanization that the vitally important and great role of agriculture in the life of all of us can and should be emphasized. It is to the credit of the representatives of the various components of agri-business that they had this vision long before it was entertained in the legislative halls.

It would be an unjustified and, I think, unfortunate slight to these representatives of our farm orientated free enterprise if we failed to extend the recognition of the importance this kind of program could hold, especially at a time when we are groping for the answers to this massive and frustrating problem of increasing the bread of mankind. I am sure my Republican colleagues do not wish to discourage these private efforts. They have not, do not, and will not seek public funds for the accomplishment and maintenance of their project.

I hope that you will reconsider your position and allow a unanimous consent for us to bring back on the floor H. Con. Res. 313.

I appreciate your patience and courteous consideration, and remain

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANNA,
U.S. Congressman.

PERMITTING PERSONS FROM COUNTRIES ASSISTING THE UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN VIETNAM TO RECEIVE INSTRUCTION AT THE THREE SERVICES ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3887) to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 3887

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by inserting the following section after section 4345:

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17588

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 18, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend section 8 (g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 *That section 8 (g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic*
4 *Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h (g)), is*
5 *amended to read as follows:*

6 “(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer
7 under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by
8 him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance
9 making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural com-
10 modity, or performing a conservation practice. Such as-
11 signment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a

1 member of the county committee or by an employee of such
2 committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose
3 deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Cor-
4 poration, the Farmers Home Administration, or a produc-
5 tion credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Admin-
6 istration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded
7 officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be
8 filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not
9 be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This
10 provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any
11 liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if pay-
12 ment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence
13 of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such
14 regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the
15 provisions of this subsection."

Passed the House of Representatives October 17, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

October 18, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Senate

- 3 -

Oct 20, 1966

issue leases for the development of geothermal steam." p. D1028

Sen. Randolph urged more coal research "to improve the efficiency and economy of operation of coal-burning electric power plants." pp. 26838-9

15. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM. Passed without amendment H. R. 17588, to authorize assignments of ACP payments. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26931

16. WATER. Concurred in House amendment to S. J. Res. 167, to enable the U. S. to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the U. S. in 1967. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 26931
Sen. McGovern inserted an address by the President of the National Farmers Union in which he stated that the national water shortage which "has come upon us almost without notice" will demand "nation-sized thinking" to solve the shortages. pp. 26847-8

17. LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION. Sen. Simpson expressed the hope that "legislative reorganization will be high on the agenda for the 90th Congress." pp. 26839-44

18. FERTILIZER. Sen. McGovern stated that increased fertilizer production and utilization is essential for the war against world hunger and inserted several articles on the subject. pp. 26855-7

19. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Proxmire discussed a review of Sen. Douglas' book, "America in The Market Place: Trade, Tariffs and the Balance of Payments." pp. 26907-8

20. POLLUTION. Sen. Nelson inserted various statements and letters dealing with environmental pollution including a summary of USDA comments on the President's Science Advisory Committee report, "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment." pp. 26946-54

(THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD states that action of both houses for Oct. 20 will be continued in Part 2. pp. 26977, 27054

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. SUGAR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Rumsfeld stating that the Department's failure to anticipate the sugar shortage has resulted in harm to the consumer and great profits for the few, and insertion of a Wall Street Journal report entitled "Commodities: Further Price Boosts For Candy, Cookies, Ice Cream Loom as Ingredient Costs Rise." pp. 5418-9

22. WATER. Rep. Udall inserted a speech by Sen. Moss citing advancement in solutions to the water shortage problem urging further methods of conserving our water supply. pp. A5425-7

23. PERSONNEL. Rep. Vivian praised the devotion to duty of Federal employees, mentioning this Department, and stated that the concept of comparability between Federal pay rates and those in private industry is a totally reasonable one. p. A5431
Rep. Olsen, Mont., expressed gratitude for having been appointed as a member of the Bipartisan Commission To Study Federal Laws Limiting Political Activity by Officers and Employees of Government, and inserted a statement by Mr. Ramspeck dealing with matters to be investigated. pp. A5436-8

24. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Springer discussed LeRoux's booklet "The Farmers' Worst 5 Years," stating that "it behooves me to report these facts as stated by Mr. LeRoux in order that the public may know about them...." p. A5433

BILL INTRODUCED

25. RECREATION. H. R. 18505 by Rep. Vanik, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Cuyahoga River Valley National Recreation Area, in the State of Ohio; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

0

COMMITTEE HEARING OCT. 21:

Supplemental appropriations, conferees (exec).

000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all committee members have been consulted, and there are no objections to this procedure.

Mr. President, the bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to convey by quitclaim deed all interests of the United States in 9.06 acres of land located in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a nonprofit membership corporation organized and existing under Alabama law.

The 9.06 acres of land involved constitutes a community cemetery and was a part of the Skyline Farms project acquired by the Alabama Rural Rehabilitation Corp., for subdivision and development as individual farm units. It was subsequently conveyed in trust to the United States on August 16, 1937. The project consisted of approximately 13,000 acres with something more than 2,000 acres of wasteland, steep bluffs, and very rough timber areas.

The record of this acquisition did not reflect the existence of the cemetery, and it was discovered when the property was being subdivided as individual farm units. Consequently, all of the project property except this cemetery had been disposed of, and the Farmers Home Administration has been without means to convey this 9.06 acres to the local community.

Although the records of the real estate transaction and abstract title for the Government acquisition did not show a conveyance or a dedication of any of the area for cemetery purposes, the cemetery area was apparently a part of the land involved in the conveyance. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture believes that it did get title to the cemetery tract as a part of the larger purchase.

The Farmers Home Administration informed the committee that the cemetery is of no value to the Government, and they favor its return to the local people. In fact, the people of the local community have been requesting title to the cemetery for a number of years.

The committee feels that, in view of the fact that this 9.06 acre cemetery is of no possible value to the Government, the Farmers Home Administration should be permitted to convey by quitclaim deed all interests of the United States in this land to the Skyline Churches Cemetery Corp. Such action would be beneficial to the local people who would then feel more free to maintain the cemetery than they would if the property remained in the hands of the Government. There would be no additional cost to the Government as a result of enactment of this bill, and as a matter of fact there may be saving in administrative and other costs.

The Department favors the enactment of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in requesting Senate approval of H.R. 10876.

I have examined the bill in light of the so-called Morse formula and find that it does not violate the formula.

House Report No. 2211 on the bill states that "this 9.06-acre cemetery is of no possible value to the Government."

The Farmers Home Administration testified that the cemetery is of no value to the Government, and the Department of Agriculture has been advised that the conveyance is sought so that the cemetery can be improved and maintained.

In fact, Mr. President, the transfer saves the Federal Government maintenance costs and also relieves it of what I consider to be a very clear obligation, the carrying out of which would entail Federal expenditures, and that is the clear obligation of keeping the cemetery neat and maintained and in proper condition.

The United States gives up no value under the bill; therefore, the Morse formula is inapplicable, and I join in asking for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10876) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 17588, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17588) to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee is discharged, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all committee members have been contacted, and there are no objections to this procedure.

The bill would amend the existing law to simplify procedures under which farmers may assign diversion and other payments to be received. Existing law limits the authority to witness signatures of an assignment to members of the county committee or the employees thereof. The bill would permit assignments to be witnessed by a bonded officer of: First, a bank whose deposits are insured by the FDIC; second, the Farmers Home Administration; or third, a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration.

The bill would expedite the process of signing assignments without it in any manner damaging the security of the farmer, the lending institutions, or the Department of Agriculture. At present, farmers may be required to make several trips to the local committee office before the assignment can be completed. The Department of Agriculture favors the enactment of the bill as does the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

I ask for passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 17588) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER FOR PEACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, and move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 167) to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor, which was, on page 2, line 8, strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert "\$900,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the only difference is that the sum has been reduced from \$1.2 million, agreed to by the Senate, to \$900,000, agreed to by the House, and we are willing to accept the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 237, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ENTITLED "SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on House Concurrent Resolution 1034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1034, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an additional three thousand copies of House Document 237, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Sino-Soviet Conflict and Its Implications", be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1034) was agreed to.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the District of Columbia Crime Commission this past July issued a report, widely publicized in the press, which deals in great detail with Washington's police department and its administration.

Next Monday, October 24, the District Commissioners are due to report to President Johnson the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Crime Commission. And later, at the end of the month, the Crime Commission is expected to submit its final report.

Because I have been concerned with crime and the problems facing the police in our Nation's Capital for several years, I have agreed with the Commission that more effective crime control procedures are needed in this city.

At the same time, however, I take issue with the direction and tone of the July report, particularly with the publicity surrounding it, then and now, and with several of the specific recommendations advanced by the Commission for improving the Metropolitan Police Department.

First, I would like to point out that the department has made important changes in recent months, some of which have resulted from the Crime Commission's recommendations and the new focus on police problems, and others which were sought long before the Commission undertook its project. As we await the final recommendations of the Commission and the department's report to the President, I would like to comment on the situation in general and explain my objections to certain specific aspects and attitudes of the Crime Commission's report.

Perhaps basic to my position is my conviction that it is entirely unfair to deposit the blame for shortcomings in the department at the doorstep of John B. Layton, who became the chief of police only 2 years ago. The Commission's report and some of its supporters in Congress have failed to emphasize the fact that since he took over the department, Chief Layton has instituted a number of significant revisions in the organization, administration, and operation of the police force.

Let me cite a few examples:

The Commission has been critical of the department's organization and recommended a reduction in the number of precincts and a reassignment of command personnel to improve administrative and operational efficiency.

Yet early in 1965, Chief Layton himself instituted an organizational study of the police force. He discontinued this study when he learned that the Commission had contracted with the International Chiefs of Police for a similar evaluation.

The police department has been reproached for not getting enough patrolmen away from clerical duties and out on the streets.

Yet in 1965 Chief Layton requested funds for programs to reduce excessive paperwork demands on officers and began to improve communications in general, with the principal goal of making more men available for actual police work.

Much progress has now been made toward developing computerized records, a modernized communications system, a civilian clerical staff, and improved recruiting and training programs.

It should be noted that here, as so often before, the funds for these efforts have not been provided by Congress, and Chief Layton has had to rely largely on money provided under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

The Commission's July report also indicated that the police department's number of motor vehicles is inadequate.

Yet Chief Layton has requested more cars, has gotten them, and has instituted a highly successful one-man scout car program within the past 2 years. Since then, he has requested additional funds for more cars, for scooters, for more men.

I think in all fairness to Chief Layton it should be pointed out that he had taken action with regard to every aspect of the functions of his department which the Crime Commission took to task.

This is true with respect to community relations activities; it is true with respect to the recruitment of police officers; and it is true with respect to building and equipment replacement programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my remarks, a list of outlining all of the activities initiated by Chief Layton since he took over command of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not question that there are differences between the innovations which Chief Layton has proposed or developed and the recommendations of the Crime Commission, but I do question whether the Commission's report should be considered as a new revelation, or as the final word pertaining to the solution of Washington's police problems.

I want to note here that the Commission's report has been based in large part on a study conducted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. And while I am in no way critical of the association's report, it must be realized that proposing textbook type changes and innovations is a great deal easier than putting them into effect, in actual practice in an actual police department which has grown, developed and functioned according to certain policies for a number of years—and in my estimation has done a good job of enforcing the law under the most difficult conditions.

Again, I speak as one who has studied the problems of the Metropolitan Police force since I became a member and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

I took to the Senate floor in March of 1962 and spoke on crime and delinquency in the Nation's Capital. My first recommendation was that the Congress take immediate steps to meet the needs of the police department. I asked for an immediate buildup of its authorized strength, a speed up of the man-dog team program, and an increase in the number of police cruisers, especially in the Juvenile Bureau.

I recall distinctly that during that same year the police department was asking for the kind of improvements, the kind of manpower buildup, the kind of modern equipment and the kind of study grants that the Crime Commission has since accused it of not having.

Let me be more specific and refresh the memories of those who now question the conduct of the Metropolitan Police Department. Back in 1962 the police department asked for funds to conduct a broad study of the crime problem in this

city so that it could better allocate its manpower, equipment, and other resources for more effective law enforcement.

The money was not made available.

In 1962 the department asked for more scout cars and other specialized vehicles on the street and for more modern equipment so that it could utilize its uniformed forces in actual crime control rather than in auxiliary duties.

The funds for these improvements were only partially appropriated.

In 1962 the department asked for more men to build up its authorized strength and over half the appropriation was denied by the District of Columbia Commissioners.

Today, the reports of the Crime Commission and the International Chiefs of Police are critical of the shortcomings in the Metropolitan Police Department without stressing for the benefit of the public and the press that both Chief Layton and his predecessor, Chief Murray, have gone to the Commissioners and to Congress asking for the money, the understanding, and the help that is essential for any type of reorganization or improvement.

Over the years since 1962, the police department has received some of the things it has asked for—but certainly not all of them. And we know, as is true with other departments, that the formal budget requests contain by and large only items that are expected to be approved.

So, let no one place the Commission's criticisms at the feet of Chief Layton. To do so would be grossly unfair. It is, of course, not Chief Layton, but the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that can give to the Metropolitan Police most of the material means of improved effectiveness called for in the report of the Crime Commission.

The point that has been lost in the Commission's report is that no police chief can build an ideal department if he has to beg and bargain with at least two funding authorities for supplying the needs of his police force.

The point has been lost that no police chief can build a great department if he gets his requests approved in bits and pieces, never quite knowing what will be allowed and what refused.

And the point is lost that no police chief can establish good planning and an optimally efficient department if he has to depend on the uncertainty of approvals of his requests, which in the case of the District of Columbia depend on the whims of the Commissioners and on the sporadic, often crisis-induced generosity of Congress.

Before I take issue with some of the specific recommendations made by the District of Columbia Crime Commission, and the chiefs of police, I want to point out that the reports do not give sufficient recognition to the cold realities of police administration in this city—particularly to the fact that it comes under three authorities, the White House, the Congress, and the Commissioners.

I want to point out that while the two studies resemble textbook solutions for the problems of police departments all



Public Law 89-742
89th Congress, H. R. 17588
November 2, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 1167

To amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), is amended to read as follows:

"(g) A payment which may be made to a farmer under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance making a crop, handling or marketing an agricultural commodity, or performing a conservation practice. Such assignment shall be signed by the farmer and witnessed by a member of the county committee or by an employee of such committee, except that where the assignee is a bank whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farmers Home Administration, or a production credit association supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, such assignment may be witnessed by a bonded officer of the lending institution. Such assignment shall be filed with the county committee. Such assignment shall not be made to pay or secure any preexisting indebtedness. This provision shall not authorize any suit against or impose any liability upon the Secretary or any disbursing agent if payment to the farmer is made without regard to the existence of any such assignment. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

Agriculture
loans.
Assignment of
payments.
52 Stat. 35.
16 USC 590h.

Approved November 2, 1966.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 2223 (Comm. on Agriculture).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):

Oct. 17: Considered and passed House.
Oct. 20: Considered and passed Senate.

